# Systemicism & the Peaceful Divorce from Hierarchies

## Preface:

In the scope of global cultural and socio-political issues herein, it has become necessary to define a revolution or revolutionary movement by not only the merit of its ideals but also the methodology and means by which its visionaries may employ so as to ascertain the ideal world. “Idealism” within the context of this text refers not to the metaphysical perspective (*i.e. Marx, Idealism as the antithesis of Materialism*), but rather the necessity of the individual and the intellectual to envision a better world, or an *ideal* world as an antidote to the “real” world.

It is worth noting that what is, in layperson's terminology “the way things are” is not necessarily “true;” the institutions as a social construct may be “real” by the sole nature that we have ourselves willed such powers into existence by enforcement. But it comes a time that one must divorce oneself from the abridged purview of a corrupt system of powers and analyse these structures as a product of systems of oppression; to view the existence of currencies and formalized systems of trade as a means by which corporate society is enforced. The same applies to the existence of nations and nationalism and the national system; these are false idols designed to project the illusion of straightforwardness or simplicity to a convergent and absurd existence.

Similarly is the case with organized religion, see Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*: [Religion as] “Philosophical Suicide” (Camus 10). By adhering solely to organized religion, one negates the internal rumination innate to a philosophical journey of the self; or introspection, rather the substitution thereof with an established spiritual meaning rather than a philosophical one. I believe it is in the best interests of most that we see a world with no gods as not some devoid and desolate existence but rather take solace in that fact, and use it to create a meaning of our own, a meaning which may vary by individual. This way

each individual may remain free to pursue their meaning, be it borne of reason or of belief or fatih, but never dogmatic.

Though I do oppose the common Enlightenment-era sentiment of the uniform nature of the rational mind as a collective; I hardly believe that is true. I believe that rational minds will always run into disagreement and incongruence because the nature of the reasonable mind is to question authority, to question standards, and to question the status quo or dominant ideas within culture, which themselves are various and transient. Anthropologically it is reductive to assume a global monoculture wherein all rebellion must be rebellion against the global oppressive as opposed to individualised oppressive systems that are created themselves of an analogous but separately-arising root phenomenon.

Similarly to the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, I should include within the preface a statement of my own fallibility. I hold not only the capacity for incorrection as well as the certainty of inconsistency within any of my work. My ethical system, like all other ethical systems attributable to an individual, are infinitely-variable and they are conditional; this is why I would refrain from prescriptive ethics as it seems to me a caveat is inevitable at one point or another. All humans, to some extent, pick-and-choose their personal response to a presented situation. I digress, if you understand the breadth of what I have written herein (the entire textual corpus) you are smarter than I am. I myself do not intend this as a guidebook or structural body by which to build purely off of. Rather, I consider it largely tentative: to adhere entirely to Systemicism is, paradoxically, to betray it. The ideas put forth are to be considered in the context of one's own; anyone who reads on Systemicism can certainly point out something which I have missed.

To continue the writings I present are not a pure statement of a direct methodological or ideological axiom itself but rather a subtext and an abstraction of an ideal which is to be sought by those perhaps more left-brained than I. I do not claim to be speaking on pure behalf of rationale, I am

principally an emotional individual with a chemical mind, and it is by emotion and introspection that I have come to conclusions henceforth. Thus what is meant by *Idealism* within the context of the proclamation; the capacity for the mental construction and imagination of an "ideal" world devoid of oppression, of hierarchy, of violence. What I hope is that the ideal abstraction[s] put forth will bring to fruition a divorce from the constrained worldview of capitalism and the corporate and hierarchically-tribal society.

Reason in itself is inherently a double-side of the proverbial coin of empathy and ethicality. The foremost atrocities of human society have been borne neither of reason or emotion, but rather a perversion of either at the hands of some individual's desire for power, for control, for authority, and quite often in capitalism, money. That end goal is neither rational nor ethical. Such individuals seek to ascertain this power through the unaware submission and zealotry of the uneducated and the mob-mentality of an upset people who have themselves resigned to an immutable ideology and neglected their own introspection and search for meaning. This is why I intend Systemicism not as a stone-set doctrine but rather a common ideal.

Similarly, there is extant no viable means by which *motive* may be verified truthfully and without fault. Throughout history, many right-wing nationalist movements have been disguised under a false projection of leftist rhetoric. Systemicism is inherently left-wing because it is focused on the dissolution of hierarchies within society, though differs from traditional leftists movements in the sense that it is focused not on a pure collective but rather on the means of the individual actor as a member not of a collective but more so a network of interacting entities driven by some sort of systematic construct brought forth to be self-fulfilling; more akin to a sort of critical theory by means of analysis. It mustn't exist localized, and it knows, and shall never know a nation.

## Systemicism Defined:

Systemicism is a working designation for a set of social, political, and philosophical ideals that I present that are primarily focused on pacifism and the ideal structure of a social revolution which I propound for consideration among left-wing, anti-authoritarian movements. It is not a hard label, nor is it or shall it be a faction or overarching prescription for a way of unified thinking. It is not an antithesis to collectivist thought of the past but rather a more post-modern movement stemming forth. In other words, in order to create true progress, we must not only dismantle the systems and arguments of the oppressors but also rigourously parse our own convictions and intellectual standpoints for vulnerabilities, loopholes, or contradictions which could work in the favor of the opposition.

Let it be known that a world free of violence is not a world devoid of melancholy, of heartache, or of rage, of indignation. The aforementioned are the paramount of a people invulnerable and unwilling to submit to an oppressive. What it is, is a world free of hatred, for hatred is the ideology of violence, and it is the intellectual manifestation of the physical existence of violence. Violence is to physicality and to interaction as hatred is to outlook and to dialogue.

One implicit conviction of Systemicism is the characterization of the nature of a revolution as not to exclusively be defined as its ideal, but to be judged according to its intellectual structure as well as its tactics and methodologies, as the latter are the outward manifestations of internal value. The extent to which violence is employed by a revolutionary movement is indicative; it is a verifier of the validity of the strength of ethical conviction within the heart and within the mind of the revolutionary. Actions are ideological as are words because they themselves are the actualization of thought materially. Historically, the revolutions which have been notably violent in nature have led to the installment of authoritarianism and oppressive institutions at their end, often representing a false and illusory perversion of its original intent. Revolutionary methodologies are indicative of the type of society that will be installed should they succeed; a violent, highly-organized movement expedites the process of change, but at the expense that

once theirs becomes the dominant thought such violence and organization will then translate to militarism and hierarchy respectively.

Similarly, this is the reason that a revolution of Systemicism would employ the gradual substitution of extant institutions of oppression with less formally-codified instances. These instances will eventually become unnecessary and wither away leaving behind a non-hierarchical state of unified individuality. This is derived to Engels (*i.e. "The state will wither away;" hardly a novel concept*) but it is distinct from classical Marxist theory in its manner of implementation. The principle of Systemicism is to avoid the absolute status of one class or individual as a de facto ruler or disciplinarian; this would involve temporarily reducing the extent of leadership into several temporary institutions ultimately bound to the will of the common interest.

Systemicism advocates for the rejection of "dominant" individuals from influence, social and political. Those who desire to dominate upon others in any way are as well intent on dominating over others' minds and autonomies as dominance is a similar outward extent of ideology as is violence. Individuals who aspire for dominance, and maintain dominance as a prerogative, and are unable to recognize the flaw of desiring explicitly control and influence over others as a means of self-fulfillment, would be in internal conflict with their own imperatives if they were not also inclined to abuse. This is because constantly leaping at power implies one's mind must exist within the purview of a society reliant on power and hierarchy, it implies that the individual has mentally "corporatized" their fellow humankind.

That stated, it is only within the abridgements of corporate worldview that makes the opposite of dominance submission. Dominance is the expression which sustains corporatized, hierarchical society; hence the true opposite of dominance is skepticism. It is the distinction of the mind; its rationale and its ethical complex, from the established hierarchies and doctrines which sustain themselves upon themselves alone. That is not to say that entire repudiation from this myopic perspective is free from any and all

dynamics of power and influence, but it must be as distant as possible from them. Henceforth I will refer to such issues as the *Axiom of Ideal*. By Axiom of Ideal I mean the necessity of establishing an ideal as to be pursued, with the knowledge that its ends is statistically intangible or inviable, but choosing to continue envisioning it and pursuing it as nonetheless it is ideal and an ultimate positive is to be obtained from the steps by which it is obtained, under the condition that its means are reflective of its ideal.

## "Gendered Society:"

By "Gendered Society" I mean not a reference of gender as an identity in the literal sense but instead a more proverbial and novel usage of the term; in reference to the aforementioned, I mean more specifically the traits expressed societally that are representative of their associated social pole. My belief is that overall society is, and has always been far too ideologically "masculine." What I see is masculinity as an ideology, and I believe that it is neglected far too often that it is a set of identifiable traits, actions, and behaviors that constitute not only an attribute but an ideology, or at the very least a system of influence. While its manifest is often largely covert, it is cult-like in nature and in means.

Because of this I would consider myself opposed to the imposition of masculinity as a construct upon generations forthcoming, as traits associated with masculinity, the consistent intention to impose oneself over and upon others, competitiveness out of its own sake, and the suppression of the emotional and the ideal world are not only harmful to collective harmony and surrounding individuals; they are as well self-destructive and self-defeating. The supposed "positives" of masculinity bring about triumph, but where? Triumph in war? In nationalism? Triumph over others? Yes, the supposed "positives" of the masculine archetype are only triumphant in the sense that they must leave someone else, or a greater collective of "else" to be triumphed over. In this case the positive is defined only as a positive by those whom it affects positively. Where in that lies ethicality?

## A Post-Binary Approach to Revolution

Systemicism views revolution through the lens of psychology as its principle tactic. Those who wish violent revolution are unaware that the installation of the revolution will inevitably devolve into a hierarchical and fundamentally right-wing establishment upon its overthrow of the existing establishment. This is because violence is rightism in nature; to establish that a result be driven by dominance, by physical power. Such is not a statement that the ends does not justify the means, rather, it is a statement that the ideological validity of the ends in itself are subject to the nature of means.

Systemicism in nature advocates for a society which is more sensitive to the emotional realities; for what else shall be the orient of leftism if not an optimization of the emotional condition of the masses? Yes, contemporary leftism is based primarily in materialism and the betterment of material condition, but why? Because material condition is an egress to emotional actualization. I should preposition this in the lens of Maslow's hierarchy of needs; it is upon a basis in material by which self-actualization is to be achieved. The right-wing foolishly views Maslow's hierarchy of needs as beginning at a set level for each and viable to be achieved by one's will alone, whilst the left acknowledges that this hierarchy is adjusted in favor of those who have historically and societally benefited from systems of oppression.

Because self-actualization is viable for the privileged alone, the privileged alone will believe that self-actualization is universally-viable. The reason that leftists advocate for the dismantling of hierarchies and universal attainment of basic needs is not solely because of man's desire for basic needs alone but more so because the fulfillment of Maslow's lower levels allows for the expansion of the mental foci into the realms of self-actualization and Maslow's higher levels. This is not to be forgotten amongst the left. I thus believe that the interior psychological reasoning for any leftist revolution is emotional as opposed to material. While it is true that human emotion is archetypal, it can generally be understood that at the root of any psyche is something which must be understood as a desire for the attainment of the actualization of the self and psyche, which is intellect, and intellect as a product of emotion's desire for fulfillment.

## The Evil of Righteousness

It should go without further clarification that military conscription is an affront to the self; it is a prescriptive, exogenous impediment upon the livelihood of a people and a person, and thus conscription is never to be employed by a state that should be considered worthy of legitimacy. One's fate shall never be left to the irresponsible and corrupted hands of hierarchical authority. Such, it is not within the rights of the institution, should it exist, to play with death. As death is inconceivable, and unimaginable, only a fool wields the last resort of nature and claims it his own.

Similarly, however, it seems understated in most traditional criticisms of militarism the effect and extent to which psychology is force. Because it is clear that the psyche is composed of a convergent sum of proverbial "true-false" logical switches, so to speak, it is generally clear that the neurotypic mind responds to stimuli in a manner which is predictable and capable of being generally understood by a set of observable behaviors and responses. This is known among the military propagandists and it is employed; no natural mind feels responsibility to a nation as no natural mind sees a nation as but a division. And likewise, no natural mind feels willing to kill or to die in the name of division. Such a conviction can only result from psychological manipulation. And this manipulation by consequence is violence in ideological form.

Probably the most terrifying instrument of this in historical society is the usage and perversion of organized religion. Prior to the inception of modern militarized capitalism the primary instrument of violent control was found within organized religion. The promise of an afterlife which is presumably superior to life on Earth has created people who are willing to risk their life, or jeopardize the lives of others, in the name of some ulterior motive that truly does not serve them but rather serves the interests of those in power, the oppressors, who have bestowed upon the population a mass means of philosophical and spiritual surrender, and have come to view life on Earth as being of sole material and a true metaphysical peace lies beyond life. This has been the greatest charlatanism in the history of man.

Death is to be defined as the cessation of the consciousness, and the autonomy of the psyche. This is not an attack on metaphysics or philosophical idealism; rather, it is an attack on the impediment of the ideal self at the means of dogmatism, and the negative of the endogenous search for meaning and identity that is intrinsic to the unbound mind. Search for meaning is tacit and necessary in human nature, but it is negated by the institution of organized theology. For this reason, I advocate for the gradual phase-out of traditional religion. The reason for which I do not ascribe myself to a religion is borne of logic, yes, however the reason for which I directly oppose religion is borne of ethics, and of humanity, and the human nature.

## Capitalism & Economic Psychology:

Though anti-capitalist, I reject Marxian historical materialism. I instead pose that the recurring elements of world history have largely been driven by a desire that is more than material, a desire that is innate to the human psyche; which is the overarching struggle for man's self-actualization. The desire for the consummation of Maslow's hierarchy of needs is to some extent the ultimate impetus of all humans. Because an exhaustive era of hitherto society has been defined by the inability of the natural capacities of the Earth to maintain the ubiquitous fulfillment of all individuals' materialistic needs, or Maslow's hierarchical base, it is understandable that any given large-scale conflict is at its core traceable to material as the basis of the hierarchy of needs is largely unmet for the majority.

To posit that material, and by proxy, class, is the primary division of society is to posit a technical truth, but a truth borne of circumstance; it is more observational than it is theoretical. A starting point, but a basis upon which extrapolation or causal analysis must be applied conclusively. If hypothetically all material necessities of man were universally fulfilled equivalently, I have no doubt that consequentially the arisen conflicts will pertain essentially (and truly) to security and the stability of life, upon which the foundation of the remaining tiers of the hierarchy must be established, and cloaked in the propaganda of

the third tier; of love, of belonging - such is the rhetoric which is known to the warmonger to be successful as it is representative of the subsequent extent of need.

At the present moment in world history, as well as in the time of Marx, most conflicts are still waged upon and for reasons pertaining to the material as opposed to conceptual, though under a guise of collective security and stability that is untrue; the abstract upon which one belligerent's waging of conflict is based would most likely be the same categorically as the abstract upon which their opposition is. If some belligerent has not the general material conditions of the other and wages violent conflict in light of this, the opposing belligerent will claim their response in the name of security, but this is untrue because it is fundamentally waged in the protection of their extant material status and is thus material in nature.

Militarists will continue, as the basis of society progresses upwards within the tiers (which has yet to occur; humanity is still at its core basic and bases its conflict around material,) to cloak their true intention and causal object in the name and rhetoric of the forthcoming hierarchical state; thus as conflict is driven by material, so its propagandists are concerned with the rhetoric of the secure and protective. A true conflict of double-edged security is irrational (though possible) as it is within the protective needs of a collective not to engage in armed conflict. Thus, as the global state of actualization increases, inversely will the amount of conflict decrease. But as actualization is viable for few, the majority continues to wage the most conflict.

I present my own understanding of the self-ideal, borne of self-psychoanalysis; the self-ideal, in my eyes, is the image and psychological profile of oneself in their actualized state, and it is distinct and variable as personalities externally, as it is the interior of personality. There is as yet no reason to believe that you are not, at your core, truly the embodiment of your self-ideal, extraneously modified and thrown off-course as the result of condition. The utopian ideal, and the ultimate goal of all individuals, is the

attainment of the self-ideal in the tangible world. Thus all human history in itself has been driven by the desire for the actualization of man.

## The Systemice:

I propose a foremost aspect of Systemicism: the Systemice (/ˈsɪs.tɛm.ˈɪsi/). The Systemice represents the root cause of an issue or set of issues in global society, not as pure material, but rather, as a result or consequence of psychological proclivity; the ascertainment of the Systemice is near-universally the result of several consequent levels of causal analysis. Seldom is a given issue's psychological causation apparent directly with a singular level of analysis, initial deductive quality must be benchmarked as a basis from which further investigation is drawn. The point at which an thereafter root-cause would effectively return to the nature of the mind itself, or alternatively self-actualization as an abstract, represents the Systemice.

Human emotion is at its core archetypal in its desires and fixations and fears, though there are evident syntaxes by which the psyche of man continues to follow. One's own perception and interpretation of signal is mental emic, and is subject to interpretation of the individual; it is emotion. The psychological and mental etic is the body from which the Systemice derives. There is a foreseeable nature of the etic mind that is the progenitor of Systemice. To attend to the Systemice of a given mass issue the bulk of its initiators must acknowledge and subsequently interpret the Systemice within their emic mind and consider alternative manners of expression by which the desire of their etic mind is viable. The manner of expression which is most beneficial to others will as well be most fulfilling to the self; this is true of expressive manners which are developmental rather than destructive: art, music, writing, poetry, and their relatives for they are referred to as the subjects for which we as human beings continue life, and for which they bring the most psychological fulfillment upon the Systemice.

## On the Nature of Violence:

To live is to be free, and to revoke life is to revoke freedom, thus revocation of life in itself is the device of authoritarians. Extant justice and legal systems exist in a mockery of nature as the confinement of one to prison is akin to conscious death; it is a mimicry of action-effects in nature. Thus there is no death in the name of freedom, but death in the name of repression; for no flag has but one soldier ever died in the name of, for all flags are the symbol of the seizing body and captor of life and freedom. All who die in the name of the flag are the victims whom it has taken. Freedom as the capacity of the sum of collective to attain self-actualization can never be achieved in violence.

Such is the reason why fascism has always come in tandem with a cult of machismo and romanticisation of war; wherein dominance is bravado, and bravado which exists and is perceived subliminally by the human mind as the ability to take life, and thus the evolutionary Systemice of the desire to experience and portray the self as such must be countered by some conscious effort. This would constitute an intellectual rebuke of gendered society, and the masculine society, which is the upholding system of violence and authoritarianism. The fulfillment of the Systemice of its motive must be delegated to the fulfillment of the constructed feminine portrayal; of care, of peace, and the custodian of knowledge or depth or intuition as a greater-level. As violent conflict withers away so will the masculine cult. Stockpiles of arms will rot beneath the trees of humanity, and trees of empathy~

## The Most Dangerous Person:

Those who live devoid of love, as defined as the human connection of intense emotional conviction between two or more individuals in addition to intimacy of the emotional plexi and unconditional commitment or desire to attain the well-being and ultimately self-actualization of another, are exceptionally dangerous in positions of influence. Those devoid of love lack an analogue thereof; and they will continue to live blind to the interpersonal consequence of their actions; as they will not project their own love for one to love for others, or consider the impact of loss truly which cannot be understood without an analogue. What victory will soothe the parent who has lost their everything, beloved child?

What triumph of one state heals the being of the partner of the loss of their one confidant to call one's own counterpart? There is none, and that is the extent of deathly victory's yields, if oxymoronic.

Moreover the equally-destructive conditional result of deprivation is those devoid of pain. Though it could simply be described as the unpleasant sensation which is primarily emotional for the purposes herein, I would refer to pain in this case as the resulting distress of loss. All pain at its core is the result of some sort of loss; of life, of a friend or lover, or of constructs or conditions ~ security, ambition, freedom, which inhibit the attainment of psychological actualization. Those who cannot see pain within themselves are doomed to bring it unto others as are those who see pain in themselves but lack the aforementioned love. Those who know love and not pain are fortunate, those who know pain and not love are unfortunate, but those who know neither love nor pain are destructive.

Who loves one loves the world; by degrees of separation. To desire the actualization of another is to wish upon them fulfillment of the *Systemice*, for themselves, for nearly everyone capable thereof which involves the fulfillment of the Systemices of others or another. Such is the continuum of humanity. Attainment of the Systemice is theoretically possible for all at once as the Systemice end goal is never impedimental unto others at its core, only in misguided attempts of expression which result from a combination of intentional social manipulation and related conditioning (particularly by masculine society), or logical misinterpretation as the result of the absence or unconscious withdrawal of introspective thought which could itself as well be attributed to the former - all humans have quintessential self-curiousity as sapient organisms, or they at least possess the capacitive means to attain it. I believe that most as yet, if prompted, would likely not accurately identify or describe the Systemice driving most particular actions, convictions, or thoughts they may face at its core.

## Subversion & Provocation:

Subversion is the ideal instrument of meaningful change to global society, but it is and should be made distinct from provocation alone; provocation itself is the means of change only if its quality of provocation itself is derived solely from the disruption of a normative state which is only so by an oppressive or unethical norm. If the quality of provocation is derived from the disruption of a purposeful and objective good, such as health, life, love, nature, then it is empty provocation of its own sake and thus meaningless harm. In other words, the object of oppression must be nested homogeneously within the targeted institution as opposed to artificially applied to the action.

Subversion on the other hand is by definition initiated against the oppressor entity because subversion is the direct antithesis of complicity. Thus I believe that the true revolution is subversion, else it is not and cannot be truly revolutionary as its tactic continues to mirror all historical iniquities which are war, violence; then the established result is unable to embody any ideal other than the ideology of violence, which is oppression as thought. To bring about meaningful change necessitates that the means of attainment of the end goal mimic the end goal itself. Improbable, perhaps and presently inviable, but the pragmatic concerns of revolutionaries are malleable and subject to novel understanding whilst the consequence of false revolution is inevitable.

Who opposes the situational oppressive opposes the global oppressive as all oppressives which are analogous by intent are manifestations of the unhealthy *Systemice* which is same or similar, else their supposed opposition is a misnomer as it is devoid of passion as applied to conviction which is innate to the true nature of opposition. To truly understand the consequences of violence and cruelty one and all must look at thyself and their nations and the human corpus through the reflective lens. Who sees not a mirror cannot see their face. If the universe will not bestow the mirror itself it is the obligation of us all to construct it and gaze into its tragic imitation.

## Death Mind & the False Inevitable:

Death mind is a descriptor to be applied to several scenarios wherein the emotional and capacitive abilities of the collective or individual are impaired as a result of the doctrine of the nation, and as a result the doctrine of the world society. The first of which is the illusion of pragmatism and the assumption of conflict as solely reactive as opposed to a product of action which is emotionally-derived; death mind presumes that the imposition of war is an attempt of man to bring meaning to the meaningless. The decision is to destroy as creation is intellectually costly. Whilst destruction is mindless, creation is not; one who is terrified of introspection and will not see one's own thought and feeling is or will be one who is destructive in action. This is why the "masculine" society discourages the expression or exploration of the emotional world; an aversion to the creative, to which the opposite is the destructive.

When theoretic possibility is posited it is only impossible if human mental barriers are the prime constructs of its inviability. Thus change must be psychological in nature. Who says that peace could only be achieved through the barrel of a gun is foolish or perhaps inculcated at best. The statement is absurd. For violence truly is not ever a means to an end as such violence is the harbinger of true intent, and as intent is malleable by its means of acquisition it will be undesirable. The observed outcome of prior conflict results in the clear definition of a belligerent stage followed by one or both parties therein arriving at a resolution. Such a resolution is the result of influence of action upon individuals in power. The belligerent stage serves only the purpose of manipulation unto the opposing party to arrive at a resolution. All warfare is psychological warfare. Much more influential than material at its face value is psychology and thought and emotion, which derive from the material condition to one or another degree.

Ideological results of the proposed state of death mind are less akin to conscious thought and more akin to a systematic output of data. There are those who certainly do give thought in depth yet continue to spread the doctrine of this afflicted mind. They have perhaps engaged in logically-sound analysis but they have failed in the ascertainment of the end goal. The end goal or *axiom of ideal* must use logic as its tool of resolution but not a pure resolution of its own. An axiom of ideal is principally an

emotional conviction and should be given as well the extent of consideration to its fullest. Real-politik and similar political axioms are contempt manifest in thought; the creations of those who know no love and see no pain. It is but the mechanism of destruction that plagues the masses and poisons political discourse for those who have never heard the cries of a mother distraught at the loss of her child to war, or the child at the loss of a parent, or the scream of the conscripted, never have they heard nor felt nor put one one-billionth of a thought to human cost and emotion. That is what is meant by the *death mind*.